UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/531,724	04/18/2005	Takeshi Shimoda	4495-085	2300	
	22429 7590 08/19/2008 LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP			EXAMINER	
1700 DIAGON.		STULII, VERA			
SUITE 300 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1794		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/19/2008	PAPER	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commence	10/531,724	SHIMODA, TAKESHI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	VERA STULII	1794				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	– action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/18/2005.	4)	r (PTO-413) ate				

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 is rendered indefinite for the recitation "milk is added to said second mixture as a part of or instead of the water". Regarding claim 3, the phrase "instead of the water" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear how water could be completely substituted by milk, if the presence of water is required in claim 1, and claim 3 is dependent from claim 1.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and § 103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Shimoda (JP 2001-017154).

In regard to claim 1, Shimoda discloses a method for manufacturing Shochu including the steps of cultivating koji mold (Aspergillus oryzae) upon and into steamed rice; making starter mash by keeping a first mixture, which consists of said koji mold, yeast, and alkaline spring water for 2-4 days ([[006], [007], [0013]); making mash by fermenting a second mixture, which consists of said starter mash, one or more steamed vegetables (rice), and additional water ([0014]); filtrating said mash in order to separate its solid and liquid parts ([0017]); and distilling said liquid [0017]).

Shimoda is silent as to the particular amounts of hydrogen carbonate ions. However, Shimoda specifically outlines that the use of alkaline spring water ("sodium hydrogen carbonate pond") is desired ([0009]). Shimoda discloses high content of bicarbonate ion in such water, and the fact that saccharification and alcoholic fermentation "will be performed efficiently due to the use of this water" ([0009]).

Regarding the amount of ions recitation, it is noted that although the reference does not specifically disclose every possible quantification or characteristic of alkaline spring water, such as amount of ions, this characteristic would have been inherently expected to be in the claimed range absent any clear and convincing evidence and/or arguments to the contrary. In any case, once it was known to employ water that contains hydrogen carbonate ions, the particular concentration of the hydrogen carbonate ions, and the particular concentration of the ions in the water would have been an obvious optimization, routinely determinable. It is also noted that it is assumed that the method steps are performed at a room temperature.

In regard to claim 2, Shimoda discloses rice ([0014]).

In regard to claim 3, Shimoda discloses that milk is added to said second mixture as a part of the water ([0014]).

In regard to claim 4, Shimoda discloses cow milk ([0014]).

In regard to claim 5, Shimoda discloses that the amount of cow milk is less than 1.5 times of the weight of the total amount of water added to said first mixture and said second mixture ([0014]).

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VERA STULII whose telephone number is (571)272-3221. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am-3:30 pm, Monday-Friday.

Application/Control Number: 10/531,724 Page 5

Art Unit: 1794

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Keith Hendricks can be reached on (571) 272-1401. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steve Weinstein/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

VS